

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 WAYMO LLC,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
16 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE  
UNDER SEAL ITS PRÉCIS IN SUPPORT  
OF ITS REQUEST TO FILE A MOTION  
IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE  
OR ARGUMENT CHARACTERIZING  
MR. JACOBS' ALLEGATIONS**

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11 and 79-5, Plaintiff Waymo LLC (“Waymo”) respectfully requests to file under seal information in its Précis in Support of its Request to File a Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence or Argument Characterizing Mr. Jacobs’ Allegations (“Waymo’s Précis”), filed concurrently herewith. Specifically, Waymo requests an order granting leave to file under seal the portions of the documents as listed below:

Document	Portions to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party
Waymo’s Précis	Highlighted in blue	Defendants

### **I. LEGAL STANDARD**

Civil Local Rule 79-5 requires that a party seeking sealing “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civil L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.* In the context of non-dispositive motions, materials may be sealed so long as the party seeking sealing makes a “particularized showing” under the “good cause” standard of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Auto Insurance Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135, 1138 (9th Cir. 2003)).

### **II. DEFENDANTS’ CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

Waymo seeks to seal the above-identified portions of these documents because Defendants have designated the information confidential and/or highly confidential. Declaration of Jonathan Francis (“Francis Decl.”) ¶ 3. Waymo takes no position on the merits of sealing the designated material, and expects Defendants to file one or more declarations in accordance with the Local Rules. Francis Decl. ¶ 4.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

In compliance with Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), redacted and unredacted versions of the above listed documents accompany this Administrative Motion. For the foregoing reasons, Waymo respectfully requests that the Court grant Waymo’s Administrative Motion.

1 DATED: January 17, 2018

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
LLP

2  
3 By /s/ Charles K. Verhoeven

Charles K. Verhoeven

4 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 WAYMO LLC,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
16 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DECLARATION OF JONATHAN  
FRANCIS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF  
WAYMO LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL ITS  
PRÉCIS IN SUPPORT OF ITS REQUEST  
TO FILE A MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO  
PRECLUDE EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT  
CHARACTERIZING MR. JACOBS'  
ALLEGATIONS**

I, Jonathan Francis, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California and am admitted to practice before this Court. I am an associate at the law firm Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, counsel for the Plaintiff Waymo LLC ("Waymo"). I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this Declaration, and if called as a witness I would testify competently to those matters.

2. I make this declaration in support of Waymo's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal ("Waymo's Administrative Motion") confidential information in its Précis in Support of its Request to File a Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence or Argument Characterizing Mr. Jacobs' Allegations ("Waymo's Précis"). Waymo's Administrative Motion seeks an order sealing the following materials:

Document	Portions to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party
Waymo's Précis	Highlighted in blue	Defendants

3. Waymo's Motion and exhibits thereto contain information that Defendants have designated as confidential and/or highly confidential.

4. Waymo takes no position on the merits of sealing the designated material, and expects Defendants to file one or more declarations in accordance with the Local Rules.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in San Francisco, California, on January 17, 2018.

By /s/ Jonathan Francis

Jonathan Francis  
Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

#### **SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Jonathan Francis.

/s/ Charles K. Verhoeven

Charles K. Verhoeven

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE  
UNDER SEAL ITS PRÉCIS IN SUPPORT  
OF ITS REQUEST TO FILE A MOTION  
IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE  
OR ARGUMENT CHARACTERIZING  
MR. JACOBS' ALLEGATIONS**

1 Plaintiff Waymo LLC (“Waymo”) has filed an Administrative Motion to File Under Seal  
 2 (“Waymo’s Administrative Motion”) certain information in its Précis in Support of its Request to  
 3 File a Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence or Argument Characterizing Mr. Jacobs’  
 4 Allegations (“Waymo’s Précis”).

5 Having considered Waymo’s Administrative Motion, and good cause to seal having been  
 6 shown, the Court **GRANTS** Waymo’s Administrative Motion and **ORDERS** sealed the  
 7 documents listed below:

Document	Portions to Be Filed Under Seal
Waymo’s Précis	Highlighted in blue

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2018

13 \_\_\_\_\_  
 14 HON. WILLIAM ALSUP  
 15 United States District Court Judge  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 WAYMO LLC,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
16 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939

**PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S PRÉCIS IN  
SUPPORT OF ITS REQUEST TO FILE A  
MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO PRECLUDE  
EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT  
REGARDING UBER'S INVESTIGATION  
INTO MR. JACOBS' ALLEGATIONS**

Judge: The Honorable William Alsup  
Trial Date: February 5, 2018

Plaintiff Waymo LLC (“Waymo”) submits this précis requesting permission to file a motion *in limine* to preclude Uber from introducing evidence or argument regarding its investigation and/or evaluation of the merits of the allegations in Richard Jacobs’ May 5, 2017 letter to Angela Padilla (the “Jacobs Letter”). Uber has once again improperly used the privilege as both a sword and a shield. During the latest round of discovery—ordered by the Court in response to the U.S. Attorney’s disclosure of the existence of the Jacobs Letter on the eve of trial—Uber witnesses sought to characterize the allegations in the Jacobs Letter with terms such as “fantastical” and “extortion.” However, when Waymo inquired about the details of Uber’s lengthy investigation into Mr. Jacobs’ allegations, Uber and its witnesses repeatedly hid behind the attorney-client and work-product privilege, blocking Waymo from obtaining evidence to test Uber’s characterizations of Mr. Jacobs’ allegations. Similarly, although Uber asserted a “mediation” privilege over certain of the Jacobs mediation materials, Uber and its counsel affirmatively used or volunteered other communications that would seemingly fall within that same privilege. This Court should accordingly preclude Uber from introducing any evidence or argument regarding Uber and its counsel’s or the mediator’s investigation or evaluation of the merits of Mr. Jacobs’ allegations.

### **BACKGROUND**

Since the Jacobs Letter and allegations therein were revealed to the Court and Waymo, Uber has repeatedly sought to minimize Mr. Jacobs’ claims. Uber witness Angela Padilla initially claimed that Mr. Jacobs’ allegations were “fantastical” (11/29/17 Hr’g Tr. at 17:16-21), and that Mr. Jacobs was an extortionist trying to extract a quick payday (*id.* at 31:1-21). In deposition, Ms. Padilla testified about communications with mediator Tony Piazza and volunteered that he and Uber’s counsel were “[REDACTED]” (Padilla 12/22/17 Depo., 145:20-25.) Uber’s counsel, Arturo Gonzalez, similarly implied at the parties’ December 12 hearing before Special Master Cooper—which was before Ms. Padilla’s deposition—that there was information beneficial to Uber that came out at the mediation, explaining:

[Ms. Padilla] didn’t go to [the U.S. Attorney with the Jacobs Letter] because she thought that there was damning evidence against Uber, or because it showed that we stole Waymo trade secrets. She said quite the contrary. She didn’t believe that.

1 And if she had – if she had been asked more questions about what was said at the  
 2 mediation, you would have gotten more information about why she does not  
 believe strongly that this has anything to do with us stealing stuff.

3 (12/12/17 Tr. of Hr’g Before Special Master Cooper, 101:19-102:3.) Ms. Padilla further claimed  
 4 in deposition that Mr. Piazza told Uber: “[REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]” (Padilla 12/22/17 Depo., 147:9-14, 165:17-166:10, and  
 7 167:2-17.) She also repeatedly testified that she knew that most of Mr. Jacobs’ allegations were  
 8 “[REDACTED]” and “[REDACTED]” (*see, e.g., id.* at 141:23-142:10; 228:22-230:11) based on, *inter alia*, [REDACTED]  
 9 [REDACTED] (*id.* at 229:10-15),  
 10 as well as [REDACTED] (*id.* at  
 11 229:16-22). Ms. Padilla also affirmatively relied on these interviews to assert that [REDACTED]  
 12 [REDACTED] (*id.* at 203:15-205:20).

13 However, when Waymo sought discovery about the Jacobs investigation, and what Uber’s  
 14 months-long investigation determined about the Jacobs allegations, Uber repeatedly objected. Ms.  
 15 Padilla was instructed not to answer many questions regarding the details of Uber’s investigation.  
 16 (*See e.g.,* Padilla 12/22/17 Depo., 213:21-214:3 (instructing Ms. Padilla not to answer questions  
 17 regarding “[REDACTED]” based on attorney-client privilege);  
 18 *id.* at 225:16-24 ([REDACTED]  
 19 [REDACTED]); so were several other Uber witnesses. (*See e.g.,* Joe Spiegler 12/22/17 Depo., 89:6-  
 20 22 (refusing to answer whether he has personal knowledge of the veracity or substance of the  
 21 allegations in the Jacobs letter); *id.* at 191:22-192:10 ([REDACTED]  
 22 [REDACTED]);  
 23 Sidney Majalya 12/20/17 Depo., 146:23-147:7 (instructing witness not to answer any questions  
 24 regarding “actions taken by Wilmer Hale to investigate [Jacobs’ allegations] and the substance of  
 25 the investigation”); *id.* at 139:16-139:25 (Majalya explaining he was “instructed not to respond” to  
 26 questions regarding the Jacobs investigation); *id.* at 49:23-50:5 (refusing to discuss the use of  
 27 nonattributable devices at Uber); Salle Yoo 12/14/17 Depo., 247:24-248:5 (refusing to answer  
 28 whether the the Jacobs investigation [REDACTED])

1 [REDACTED]; *id.* at 253:9-23 (refusing to answer whether Ms.  
 2 Padilla was [REDACTED]).<sup>1</sup>

3 With respect to mediation communications, such as the mediation statements submitted by  
 4 either side or written communications with Mr. Piazza, Uber invoked the mediation privilege.  
 5 (12/29/2017 S. Rivera email) (“Uber does not believe that Ms. Padilla’s deposition testimony  
 6 effected a waiver of the mediation privilege”). On that basis, Uber withheld an unknown volume  
 7 of documents related to the mediation, including at least mediation statements, presentations made  
 8 at the mediation, and communications with Mr. Piazza.

### 9 ARGUMENT

10 The propriety of Uber’s privilege assertions are irrelevant to this precis, and Waymo does  
 11 not challenge them at this time. Uber is not, however, entitled to use privilege as both a sword and  
 12 a shield; it cannot rely at trial on its investigation and/or evaluation of the merits of the allegations  
 13 in the Jacobs Letter, having refused to provide Waymo with the necessary information to evaluate  
 14 those assertions. The Court should therefore preclude Defendants from presenting evidence or  
 15 argument regarding their investigation and/or evaluation of the merits of Mr. Jacobs’ allegations, as  
 16 well as any comments purportedly made by the mediator.

17 Uber has repeatedly attempted to use privilege as both a sword and a shield in this litigation.  
 18 Early in the case, the Court gave Uber a deadline of June 1 to waive privilege if it was going to do  
 19 so. (Dkts. 438, 447.) Uber chose not to do so. (Dkt. 531.) Nevertheless, Uber continues to try to  
 20 rely on privileged information when it suits Uber’s purposes. Sometimes Uber’s selective disclosure  
 21 resulted in waiver. (Dkt. 1506). In other instances, it was remedied by preclusion. (Dkt. 1172  
 22 (holding that Defendants cannot selectively waive privilege with respect to Anthony Levandowski’s  
 23 reasons for pleading the Fifth Amendment, and noting that “[u]nder Uber’s theory all a party would  
 24 have to do is cherry pick the communications they want the opposing party to see and identify those  
 25 as not privileged, all the while being able to shield other not so favorable communications from  
 26 disclosure even if they are about the very same topic by claiming those communications privileged.

27  
 28 <sup>1</sup> Additional examples of Uber witnesses’ hiding behind privilege are readily available.

1 The law of privilege is not that unfair.”); Dkt. 1267 (denying motion for relief from Magistrate  
 2 Judge’s Order regarding same).) This Court characterized Uber’s attempt to shroud conversations  
 3 in the attorney-client privilege by having an attorney present for conversations, but then relying on  
 4 those conversations that are helpful to Uber, a “slick practice.” (Dkt. 1267.) Other courts similarly  
 5 preclude parties from using privilege as a sword and shield at the *in limine* stage. *Columbia Pictures*  
 6 *Television, Inc. v. Krypton Broad. of Birmingham, Inc.*, 259 F.3d 1186, 1196 (9th Cir. 2001)  
 7 (affirming district court’s *in limine* ruling prohibiting defendant from using attorney-client  
 8 communications as both a sword and a shield); *Gutierrez-Rodriguez v. Cartagena*, 882 F.2d 553,  
 9 576 (1st Cir. 1989) (affirming district court’s decision to bar defendant from testifying at trial due  
 10 to his previous refusal to testify during discovery); *Galaxy Comp. Serv’cs, Inc. v. Baker*, 325 B.R.  
 11 544, 559 (E.D.Va. 2005) (granting motion *in limine* to prevent witness from testifying about issues  
 12 she refused to answer during her deposition on attorney-client privilege grounds); *Engineered*  
 13 *Prods. Co. v. Donaldson Co., Inc.*, 313 F.Supp. 2d 951, 1022–23 (N.D. Iowa 2004) (barring plaintiff  
 14 from introducing testimony at trial on issues it prevented defendant from exploring during  
 15 deposition by invoking the attorney-client privilege). Uber cannot, for example, pick and choose  
 16 when the Jacobs investigation’s details are protected by privilege on the one hand, yet on the other  
 17 hand reveal information when it is helpful to Uber. Uber similarly cannot pick and choose purported  
 18 comments from the mediator about the claims, but withhold communications with the mediator  
 19 about the claims. Instead, the information should be excluded altogether.

20       Allowing Uber to characterize the merits of Mr. Jacobs’ claims based on their investigation  
 21 and/or evaluation of the merits of the allegations in the Jacobs Letter would also prejudice Waymo.  
 22 Under FRE 403, evidence should be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by  
 23 a danger of “confusing the issues” and “wasting time.” Here, if admitted, the jury could be confused  
 24 about why it is hearing about the Jacobs Letter and an investigation that took place, but not the  
 25 details or results of the investigation. The parties would need to waste time explaining to the jury  
 26 why it will not hear all about the investigation: Uber’s privilege assertions.

### 27 CONCLUSION

28       For the foregoing reasons, Waymo requests leave to file a motion *in limine* on this issue.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: January 17, 2018

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
LLP

By /s/ Charles Verhoeven

Charles Verhoeven

Attorneys for WAYMO LLC